

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

REMARKS

Applicants have cancelled Claims 1-3 without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter contained therein. Applicants maintain that the cancellation of a claim makes no admission as to its patentability and reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of the cancelled claim in this or any other patent application.

Applicants have amended Claim 4 to be in independent form, and have amended Claims 5 and 12 to depend from Claim 4. Claim 13 is amended to replace the term "epitope tag" with the term "tag polypeptide." New Claims 14-17 have been added. Thus, Claims 4-8 and 11-17 are presented for further examination.

Applicants submit that no new matter was added by the amendments, and that support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification. Support for the amendments to Claim 13 can be found, for example, at paragraph [0229]. Support for new Claims 14-17 can be found, for example, in the claims as originally filed and paragraphs [0336], [0362], [0407], and Example 18 starting at paragraph [0529].

Applicants thank the Examiner for the initial review of the instant application, and request reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Priority

The PTO maintains that because the application lacks utility, the priority under 35 U.S.C. § 120 is not entitled to the filing date of any earlier filed priority applications.

The sequences of SEQ ID NO:77 and 78 were first disclosed in US Provisional Application 60/099,741 filed 9/10/1998 as SEQ ID NO:1 and 2 and in Figures 1 and 2. These same sequences were disclosed in PCT/US99/20111 and in 09/403,297 as SEQ ID NO:127 and 128, Figures 71 and 72. The data in Example 18 (Tumor Versus Normal Differential Tissue Expression Distribution), relied on in part for the utility of the claimed polypeptides, were first disclosed in PCT Application PCT/US00/23328 filed 8/24/2000, on page 93, line 3, through page 96, line 35. Thus, Applicants maintain that the present application is fully entitled to the benefit of at least the priority date of August 24, 2000.

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §101 – Utility

The PTO maintains its rejection of Claims 1-8 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as lacking utility for the reasons set forth on pages 2-3 of the Office Action mailed June 23, 2004 and pages 3-9 of the Final Office Action mailed December 13, 2004. The PTO asserts that the data of Example 18 are insufficient because “there is critical information lacking which includes: whether differences in nucleic acid expression of PRO1357 were significant, under what conditions differences could be detected, and what levels (relative or absolute) were detected in tumor and normal control.” Advisory Action, page 2. The PTO asserts that the claimed invention lacks utility because the specification does not answer questions that a clinical technician might have, such as “How many samples would be needed? What sensitivity would be needed? Would the normal tissue have to be a pooled sample or could it be from a single individual?” Final Office Action, page 4.

The PTO dismisses the Grimaldi declaration indicating that, regardless of the statements of the declaration, the claimed polypeptides lack utility because the specification does not provide the claimed subject matter “in a form readily usable” which allegedly must include details such as “necessary sample size, expression level range for normal and tumor tissues, types of stomach or lung tissue that can be used.” Final Office Action, page 4. The PTO dismisses the Polakis declaration as only providing conclusions without evidentiary support, and because “the instant specification provides no information regarding decreased mRNA levels of PRO1357 in tumor samples relative to normal samples. Only relative gene expression data was presented.” Final Office Action, page 5.

The PTO concludes that Applicants’ evidence fails to overcome the rejections because the evidence fails to cure insufficiencies of the specification.

Utility – Legal Standard

According to the Utility Examination Guidelines (“Utility Guidelines”), 66 Fed. Reg. 1092 (2001) an invention complies with the utility requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 101, if it has at least one asserted “specific, substantial, and credible utility” or a “well-established utility.”

Under the Utility Guidelines, a utility is “specific” when it is particular to the subject matter claimed. For example, it is generally not enough to state that a nucleic acid is useful as a diagnostic tool without also identifying the condition that is to be diagnosed.

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

The requirement of “substantial utility” defines a “real world” use, and derives from the Supreme Court’s holding in *Brenner v. Manson*, 383 U.S. 519, 534 (1966) stating that “The basic *quid pro quo* contemplated by the Constitution and the Congress for granting a patent monopoly is the benefit derived by the public from an invention with substantial utility.” In explaining the “substantial utility” standard, M.P.E.P. § 2107.01 cautions, however, that Office personnel must be careful not to interpret the phrase “immediate benefit to the public” or similar formulations used in certain court decisions to mean that products or services based on the claimed invention must be “currently available” to the public in order to satisfy the utility requirement. “Rather, *any reasonable use that an applicant has identified for the invention that can be viewed as providing a public benefit should be accepted as sufficient*, at least with regard to defining a ‘substantial’ utility.” (M.P.E.P. § 2107.01, emphasis added).

The mere consideration that further experimentation might be performed to more fully develop the claimed subject matter does not support a finding of lack of utility. M.P.E.P. § 2107.01 III cites *In re Brana*, 51 F.3d 1560, 1566, 34 U.S.P.Q.2d 1436 (Fed. Cir. 1995) in stating that “Usefulness in patent law ... necessarily includes the expectation of further research and development. The stage at which an invention in this field becomes useful is well before it is ready to be administered to humans.” Further, “[T]o violate § 101 the claimed device must be totally incapable of achieving a useful result” *Juicy Whip Inc. v. Orange Bang Inc.*, 51 USPQ2d 1700 (Fed. Cir. 1999), citing *Brooktree Corp. v. Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.*, 977 F.2d 1555, 1571 (Fed.Cir.1992).

Indeed, the Guidelines for Examination of Applications for Compliance With the Utility Requirement, set forth in M.P.E.P. § 2107 II(B)(1) gives the following instruction to patent examiners: “If the applicant has asserted that the claimed invention is useful for any particular practical purpose ... and the assertion would be considered credible by a person of ordinary skill in the art, do not impose a rejection based on lack of utility.”

Utility need NOT be Proved to a Statistical Certainty – a Reasonable Correlation between the Evidence and the Asserted Utility is Sufficient

An Applicant's assertion of utility creates a presumption of utility that will be sufficient to satisfy the utility requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 101, “unless there is a reason for one skilled in the

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

art to question the objective truth of the statement of utility or its scope.” *In re Langer*, 503 F.2d 1380, 1391, 183 USPQ 288, 297 (CCPA 1974). *See, also In re Jolles*, 628 F.2d 1322, 206 USPQ 885 (CCPA 1980); *In re Irons*, 340 F.2d 974, 144 USPQ 351 (1965); *In re Sichert*, 566 F.2d 1154, 1159, 196 USPQ 209, 212-13 (CCPA 1977). Compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 101 is a question of fact. *Raytheon v. Roper*, 724 F.2d 951, 956, 220 USPQ 592, 596 (Fed. Cir. 1983) cert. denied, 469 US 835 (1984). The evidentiary standard to be used throughout *ex parte* examination in setting forth a rejection is a preponderance of the evidence, or “more likely than not” standard. *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992). This is stated explicitly in the M.P.E.P.:

[T]he applicant does not have to provide evidence sufficient to establish that an asserted utility is true “beyond a reasonable doubt.” **Nor must the applicant provide evidence such that it establishes an asserted utility as a matter of statistical certainty.** Instead, evidence will be sufficient if, considered as a whole, it leads a person of ordinary skill in the art to conclude that the asserted utility is more likely than not true. M.P.E.P. at § 2107.02, part VII (2004) (underline emphasis in original, bold emphasis added, internal citations omitted).

The PTO has the initial burden to offer evidence “that one of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably doubt the asserted utility.” *In re Brana*, 51 F.3d 1560, 1566, 34 U.S.P.Q.2d 1436 (Fed. Cir. 1995). Only then does the burden shift to the Applicant to provide rebuttal evidence. *Id.* As stated in the M.P.E.P., such rebuttal evidence does not need to absolutely prove that the asserted utility is real. Rather, the evidence only needs to be reasonably indicative of the asserted utility.

In *Fujikawa v. Wattanasin*, 93 F.3d 1559, 39 U.S.P.Q.2d 1895 (Fed. Cir. 1996), the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit upheld a PTO decision that *in vitro* testing of a novel pharmaceutical compound was sufficient to establish practical utility, stating the following rule:

[T]esting is often required to establish practical utility. But the test results **need not absolutely prove** that the compound is pharmacologically active. All that is required is that the tests be “*reasonably* indicative of the desired [pharmacological] response.” In other words, there must be **a sufficient correlation** between the tests and an asserted pharmacological activity so as to convince those skilled in the art, **to a reasonable probability**, that the novel compound will exhibit the asserted pharmacological behavior.” *Fujikawa v. Wattanasin*, 93 F.3d 1559, 1564, 39 U.S.P.Q.2d 1895 (Fed. Cir. 1996) (internal citations omitted, bold emphasis added, italics in original).

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

While the *Fujikawa* case was in the context of utility for pharmaceutical compounds, the principals stated by the Court are applicable in the instant case where the asserted utility is for a therapeutic and diagnostic use – utility does not have to be established to an absolute certainty, rather, the evidence must convince a person of skill in the art “to a reasonable probability.” In addition, the evidence need not be direct, so long as there is a “sufficient correlation” between the tests performed and the asserted utility.

The Court in *Fujikawa* relied in part on its decision in *Cross v. Iizuka*, 753 F.2d 1040, 224 U.S.P.Q. 739 (Fed. Cir. 1985). In *Cross*, the Appellant argued that basic *in vitro* tests conducted in cellular fractions did not establish a practical utility for the claimed compounds. Appellant argued that more sophisticated *in vitro* tests using intact cells, or *in vivo* tests, were necessary to establish a practical utility. The Court in *Cross* rejected this argument, instead favoring the argument of the Appellee:

[I]n *vitro* results...are generally predictive of *in vivo* test results, i.e., there is a **reasonable correlation** therebetween. Were this not so, the testing procedures of the pharmaceutical industry would not be as they are. [Appellee] has not urged, and rightly so, that there is an invariable exact correlation between *in vitro* test results and *in vivo* test results. Rather, [Appellee's] position is that successful *in vitro* testing for a particular pharmacological activity establishes a **significant probability** that *in vivo* testing for this particular pharmacological activity will be successful. *Cross v. Iizuka*, 753 F.2d 1040, 1050, 224 U.S.P.Q. 739 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (emphasis added).

The *Cross* case is very similar to the present case. Like *in vitro* testing in the pharmaceutical industry, those of skill in the field of biotechnology rely on the reasonable correlation that exists between gene expression and protein expression (see below). Were there no reasonable correlation between the two, the techniques that measure gene levels such as microarray analysis, differential display, and quantitative PCR would not be so widely used by those in the art. As in *Cross*, Applicants here do not argue that there is “an invariable exact correlation” between gene expression and protein expression. Instead, Applicants’ position detailed below is that a measured change in gene expression in cancer cells establishes a “significant probability” that the expression of the encoded polypeptide in cancer will also be changed based on “a reasonable correlation therebetween.”

Also similar to the present case is *In re Brana*, 51 F.3d 1560, 34 U.S.P.Q.2d 1436 (Fed. Cir. 1995). In *In re Brana*, the PTO rejected the claimed compound because the Applicant did

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

not provide detailed proof that the compounds were useful. The PTO's standard was rejected as "not within the meaning of the patent laws" because "[u]sefulness in patent law ... necessarily includes the expectation of further research and development." *Id.* At 1566. In the present case, the PTO requires that in order to establish utility, a showing of "critical information" such as "under what conditions differences could be detected, and what levels (relative or absolute) were detected in tumor and normal control." Advisory Action, page 2. Example 18 of Applicants' specification and the first Declaration of J. Christopher Grimaldi (submitted as Exhibit 1 in the Response mailed September 22, 2004) describes the assays conducted and demonstrates at least a 2-fold difference in expression between tumor and normal tissues. For the PTO to require additional disclosure of details is not concordant with the meaning of the patent laws, as provided in *In re Brana*.

Taken together, the legal standard for demonstrating utility is a relatively low hurdle. An Applicant need only provide evidence such that it is **more likely than not that a person of skill in the art would be convinced, to a reasonable probability, that the asserted utility is true.** The evidence need not be direct evidence, so long as there is a reasonable correlation between the evidence and the asserted utility. The Applicant **does not need to provide evidence such that it establishes an asserted utility as a matter of statistical certainty.**

Even assuming that the PTO has met its initial burden to offer evidence that one of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably doubt the truth of the asserted utility, Applicants assert that they have met their burden of providing rebuttal evidence such that it is more likely than not those skilled in the art, to a reasonable probability, would believe that the claimed invention is useful as a diagnostic tool for cancer.

Substantial Utility

Summary of Applicants' Arguments and the PTO's Response

In an attempt to clarify Applicants' argument, Applicants offer a summary of their argument and the disputed issues involved. Applicants assert that the claimed polypeptides have utility as diagnostic tools for cancer, particularly lung and stomach cancer. Applicants are not asserting that the claimed polypeptides necessarily provide a definitive diagnosis of cancer, but

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

rather that they are useful, alone or in combination with other diagnostic tools to assist in the diagnosis of certain cancers. Applicants' asserted utility rests on the following argument:

1. Applicants have provided reliable evidence that mRNA for the PRO1357 polypeptide is at least two-fold higher in normal lung and stomach tissue compared to lung and stomach tumor, respectively;

2. Applicants assert that it is well-established in the art that a change in the level of mRNA for a particular protein, e.g. a decrease, generally leads to a corresponding change in the level of the encoded protein, e.g. a decrease;

3. Given Applicants' evidence that the level of mRNA for the PRO1357 polypeptide is decreased in lung and stomach tumor compared to normal lung and stomach tissue, respectively, it is likely that the PRO1357 polypeptide is differentially expressed in lung and stomach tumors and is therefore useful as a diagnostic tool to distinguish tumor from normal tissue. Polypeptides such as PRO1357 which are differentially expressed in certain cancers are useful as diagnostic tools.

Applicants understand the PTO to be making several arguments in response to Applicants' asserted utility:

1. The PTO has challenged the sufficiency of the evidence reported in Example 18, and states that it fails to provide critical information relating to experimental details;

2. The PTO cites Hu *et al.*, Konopka *et al.* and Haynes *et al.* to support its assertion that the literature cautions against drawing conclusions based on small changes in transcript expression levels between normal and cancerous tissue, and that mRNA levels are not predictive of protein levels;

3. The PTO concludes that based on the lack of teachings of the specification, one of skill in the art would not assume that the disclosed change in gene expression would be significant or know under what conditions the difference could be detected. The PTO also concludes that based on the literature cited in the Office Action, one of skill in the art would not assume that the disclosed change in gene expression would correlate with a change in polypeptide levels. Therefore, the PTO states that further research is required to determine if the disclosed change in PRO1357 expression supports a role for the peptide in cancerous tissue.

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

As detailed below, Applicants submit that the PTO has failed to meet its initial burden to offer evidence “that one of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably doubt the asserted utility.” *In re Brana*, 51 F.3d 1560, 1566, 34 U.S.P.Q.2d 1436 (Fed. Cir. 1995). First, the PTO has failed to offer any evidence to support its rejection of the data in Example 18 and the Declaration of Chris Grimaldi in support of these data. Second, Applicants submit that the Konopka *et al.*, Haynes *et al.* and Hu *et al.* references are not contrary to Applicants’ arguments, and therefore are not evidence to support the PTO’s position. Finally, even if the PTO has met its initial burden, Applicants have submitted enough rebuttal evidence such that it is **more likely than not** that a person of skill in the art would be convinced, **to a reasonable probability**, that the asserted utility is true. As stated above, Applicants’ evidence need not be direct evidence, so long as there is a reasonable correlation between the evidence and the asserted utility. **The standard is not absolute certainty.**

Applicants have established that the Gene Encoding the PRO1357 Polypeptide is Differentially Expressed in Certain Cancers compared to Normal Tissue

Applicants first address the PTO’s argument that the evidence of differential expression of the gene encoding the PRO1357 polypeptide in lung and stomach tumors is insufficient.

The gene expression data in the specification, Example 18, shows that the mRNA associated with protein PRO1357 was more highly expressed in normal lung tissue and normal stomach tissue compared to lung tumor and stomach tumor, respectively. Gene expression was analyzed using standard semi-quantitative PCR amplification reactions of cDNA libraries isolated from different human tumor and normal human tissue samples. Identification of the differential expression of the PRO1357 polypeptide-encoding gene in tumor tissue compared to the corresponding normal tissue renders the molecule useful as a diagnostic tool for the determination of the presence or absence of tumor. In support, Applicants submitted as Exhibit 1 in a Response mailed September 22, 2004, a first Declaration of J. Christopher Grimaldi, an expert in the field of cancer biology. This declaration explains the importance of the data in Example 18, and how differential gene and protein expression studies are used to differentiate between normal and tumor tissue (see Declaration, paragraph 7).

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

In paragraph 5 of his declaration, Mr. Grimaldi states that the gene expression studies reported in Example 18 of the instant application were made from pooled samples of normal and of tumor tissues. Mr. Grimaldi explains that:

The DNA libraries used in the gene expression studies were made from pooled samples of normal and of tumor tissues. *Data from pooled samples is more likely to be accurate than data obtained from a sample from a single individual.* That is, the detection of variations in gene expression is likely to represent a more generally relevant condition when pooled samples from normal tissues are compared with pooled samples from tumors in the same tissue type. (Paragraph 5) (emphasis added).

In paragraphs 6 and 7, Mr. Grimaldi explains that the semi-quantitative analysis employed to generate the data of Example 18 is sufficient to determine if a gene is over- or under-expressed in tumor cells compared to corresponding normal tissue. He states that any visually detectable difference seen between two samples is indicative of at least a two-fold difference in cDNA between the tumor tissue and the counterpart normal tissue. Thus, the results of Example 18 reflect at least a two-fold difference between normal and tumor samples. He also states that the results of the gene expression studies indicate that the genes of interest "can be used to differentiate tumor from normal," thus establishing their reliability. He explains that, contrary to the PTO's assertions, "The precise levels of gene expression are irrelevant; what matters is that there is a relative difference in expression between normal tissue and tumor tissue." (Paragraph 7). Thus, since it is the relative level of expression between normal tissue and suspected cancerous tissue that is important, the precise level of expression in normal tissue is irrelevant. Likewise, there is no need for quantitative data to compare the level of expression in normal and tumor tissue. As Mr. Grimaldi states, "If a difference is detected, this indicates that the gene and its corresponding polypeptide and antibodies against the polypeptide are useful for diagnostic purposes, to screen samples to differentiate between normal and tumor."

The PTO has indicated that the Grimaldi Declaration is insufficient to overcome the rejection of Claims 1-8 and 11-13 for lack of utility due to what is not provided in the specification. The PTO argues that the statement in paragraph 5 of the Grimaldi Declaration regarding more likely accuracy of pooled samples used in Example 18 is not persuasive because "without the range of variation there is insufficient guidance" in the specification. Final Office Action, page 4. The PTO agrees with the statement by Grimaldi that it is the relative level of

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

expression between normal and tumor tissues that is important, but nevertheless dismisses this statement because the specification does not provide “more specifics about necessary sample size, expression level range for normal and tumor tissues, types of stomach or lung tissue that can be used.” Final Office Action, page 4. The PTO thus concludes that the “specification has not provided the invention in a form readily usable by the skilled [artisan].” Final Office Action, page 4.

Applicants submit that the declaration of Mr. Grimaldi is based on personal knowledge of the relevant facts at issue. Mr. Grimaldi is an expert in the field and conducted or supervised the experiments at issue. Applicants remind the PTO that “[o]ffice personnel must accept an opinion from a qualified expert that is based upon relevant facts whose accuracy is not being questioned.” PTO Utility Examination Guidelines (2001) (emphasis added). In addition, declarations relating to issues of fact should not be summarily dismissed as “opinions” without an adequate explanation of how the declaration fails to rebut the Examiner’s position. *In re Alton* 76 F.3d 1168 (Fed. Cir. 1996). The PTO has not supplied any reasons or evidence to question the accuracy of the facts upon which Mr. Grimaldi based his opinion. Mr. Grimaldi has personal knowledge of the relevant facts, has based his opinion on those facts, and the PTO has offered no reason or evidence to reject either the underlying facts or his opinion. Therefore, the PTO should accept Mr. Grimaldi’s opinion with regard to his statement that “any visually detectable difference seen between two samples is indicative of at least a two-fold difference in cDNA between the tumor tissue and the counterpart normal tissue” and that the genes of interest “can be used to differentiate tumor from normal.” Together, these statements establish that there is at least a two-fold difference in expression, and that the results are reliable enough that they can be used to distinguish tumor from normal tissue.

Applicants further submit that nothing in the PTO’s Utility Guidelines and no judicial authority supports the contention that details such as sample size and reaction conditions must be disclosed in the specification to establish the utility of claimed subject matter. Applicants have asserted a utility, and such an assertion is sufficient to establish utility absent an affirmative demonstration by the PTO that the asserted utility is not credible, substantial or specific. M.P.E.P. § 2107. This affirmative demonstration by the PTO must include support for factual findings relied upon in reaching a conclusion of a lack of utility. *Id.* In the present case, the PTO

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

presents no factual findings in dismissing Applicants' assertion of utility, the data disclosed in Example 18, and supporting declaration of Mr. Grimaldi. Without presenting factual findings, the PTO cannot establish that the claims *prima facie* lack utility. Moreover, instead of attempting to establish a *prima facie* rejection, the PTO requires that the specification disclose various experimental details in order for Applicants to sufficiently establish the utility of the claimed subject matter. This basis for the utility rejection must fail for two reasons. First, it is improper for the PTO, without establishing a *prima facie* rejection, to require Applicants to provide a threshold amount of facts to initially establish the utility of the claimed subject matter. Second, by requiring experimental details such as sample size and reaction conditions such that the claimed subject matter is "in a form readily usable" (Final Office Action, page 4), the PTO improperly requires a showing that the claimed subject matter must be "currently available" to the public in order to satisfy the utility requirement. See, e.g., *Brenner v. Manson* and M.P.E.P. § 2107.01.

In conclusion, Applicants submit that the evidence reported in Example 18, combined with the first Grimaldi Declaration, establish that there is at least a two-fold difference in PRO1357 cDNA between lung and stomach tumor and normal lung and stomach tissue, respectively. Therefore, it follows that expression levels of the PRO1357 gene can be used to distinguish lung and stomach tumor tissue from their normal tissue counterparts. The PTO has not offered any significant arguments or evidence to the contrary.

As Applicants explain below, it is more likely than not that the PRO1357 polypeptide is also differentially expressed in lung and stomach tumor tissue, and can therefore be used to distinguish lung and stomach tumor tissue from normal tissue counterparts. This provides utility for the claimed polypeptides.

Applicants have established that the Accepted Understanding in the Art is that there is a Direct Correlation between mRNA Levels and the Level of Expression of the Encoded Protein

Applicants next turn to the second portion of their argument in support of their asserted utility – that it is well-established in the art that a change in the level of mRNA for a particular protein generally leads to a corresponding change in the level of the encoded protein; given Applicants' evidence of differential expression of the mRNA for the PRO1357 polypeptide in

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

lung and stomach tumor, it is more likely than not that the PRO1357 polypeptide is differentially expressed; and proteins differentially expressed in certain tumors have utility as diagnostic tools.

In response to Applicants' assertion, the PTO cites Haynes *et al.* (Electrophoresis, 19(11):1862-71 (1998)) as support for its argument that "protein levels cannot be accurately predicted from the level of the corresponding mRNA transcript." Final Office Action, page 7. For the reasons discussed below, Haynes is not contrary to Applicants' asserted utility.

Haynes studied whether there is a correlation between the level of mRNA expression and the level of protein expression for 80 selected genes from yeast. The genes were selected because they constituted a relatively homogeneous group with respect to predicted half-life and expression level of the protein products. *See* Haynes at 1863. Haynes did not examine whether a change in transcript level for a particular gene led to a change in the level of expression of the corresponding protein. Instead, Haynes determined whether the steady-state transcript level correlated with the steady-state level of the corresponding protein based on an analysis of 80 different genes.

Haynes reported to have "found a general trend but no strong correlation between protein and transcript levels." *Id.* However, a cursory inspection of Fig. 1 shows a clear correlation between the mRNA levels and protein levels measured. This correlation is confirmed by an inspection of the full-length research paper from which the data in Fig. 1 were derived, presented herein as Exhibit 2 (Gygi *et al.*, Molecular and Cellular Biology, Mar. 1999, 1720-1730). Gygi states that "there was a general trend of increased protein levels resulting from increased mRNA levels," with a correlation coefficient of 0.935, indicating a strong correlation. Gygi at 1726. Moreover, Gygi also states that the correlation is especially strong for highly expressed mRNAs. *Id.* Thus, it is not clear that Haynes even supports the Examiner's position, as Haynes did report a general trend, and Gygi reports a strong correlation between increasing mRNA levels and increasing protein levels.

The PTO focuses on the portion of Haynes where the authors reported that for some of the studied genes with equivalent mRNA levels, there were differences in corresponding protein expression, including some that varied by more than 50-fold. Similarly, Haynes reports that different proteins with similar expression levels were maintained by transcript levels that varied by as much as 40-fold. *Id.* Thus, Haynes showed that for one type of yeast, similar mRNA

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

levels for *different* genes did not universally result in equivalent protein levels for the *different* gene products, and similar protein levels for *different* gene products did not universally result from equivalent mRNA levels for the *different* genes. These results are expected, since there are many factors that determine translation efficiency for a given transcript, or the half-life of the encoded protein. Not surprisingly, based on these results, Haynes concluded that protein levels cannot always be accurately predicted from the level of the corresponding mRNA transcript *when looking at the level of transcripts across different genes*.

Importantly, Haynes did not say that for a single gene, the level of mRNA transcript is not positively correlated with the level of protein expression. Applicants have asserted that increasing or decreasing the level of mRNA for the same gene leads to an increase or decrease for the corresponding protein. Haynes did not study this issue and says absolutely nothing about it. Therefore, Haynes is not inconsistent with or contradictory to the utility of the instant claims, and offers no support for the PTO's position.

And even if Haynes supported the PTO's argument, which it does not, one contrary example does not establish that one of skill in the art would find it is more likely than not there is no general correlation between changes in mRNA level and changes in protein level for an individual gene. In fact, the working hypothesis among those skilled in the art, as illustrated by the evidence presented by both the PTO (see discussion of Konopka *et al.* below) and Applicants, is that there is a positive correlation between changes in mRNA levels and changes in protein levels for a particular gene.

In addition to Haynes *et al.*, the PTO cites a publication by Konopka *et al.* (Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, 83:4049-52 (1986)) for the proposition that gene amplification cannot be used to indicate protein expression levels. Applicants submit that the data concerning the differential expression of the PRO1357 gene presented in Example 18 relate to gene expression, not gene amplification. The description of Example 18 makes clear that the results were obtained by quantitative PCR amplification of cDNA libraries. It is well known in the art that cDNA libraries are made from mRNA, and reflect the level of mRNA for a particular gene in the source tissue. Thus, Example 18 is reporting a measure of the expression of the PRO1357 gene, *i.e.* mRNA levels, not its amplification, *i.e.*, the number of copies of PRO1357 in the genome.

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

Accordingly, the relationship between gene amplification levels and protein expression levels is irrelevant to the subject matter claimed in the present application.

While the teachings by Konopka regarding gene amplification are not at issue in this case, Konopka also teaches about the relationship between mRNA levels and levels of the corresponding protein, which is relevant to the present application. The PTO cites the statement in Konopka that "protein expression is not related to amplification of the abl gene but to variation in the level of the bcr-abl mRNA produced from a single Ph1 template." These results presented in Konopka actually present strong evidence in support of Applicants' position that there is a general understanding in the art that levels of mRNA correlate with levels of the corresponding proteins. Konopka analyzed the expression patterns of a gene associated with certain cancers. The authors show a wide variation in the levels of the protein in various cell types, and find that this variation can be attributed to the levels of the corresponding mRNA in each cell type. See, Konopka, p. 4050. Konopka thus concludes, "these combined data suggest that differential bcr-abl mRNA expression from a single gene template is responsible for the variable levels of P210^{c-abl} [the protein of interest] detected." *Id.*, p. 4051. Thus, far from supporting the PTO's assertion that it is not the norm that increased transcription leads to increased levels of the corresponding protein, Konopka strongly supports the opposite proposition asserted by Applicants - that the level of mRNA, more often than not, correlates with the level of the corresponding protein.

Thus, the references cited by the PTO as evidence that no such general understanding exists do not in any way support the PTO's arguments. To the contrary, Haynes and Konopka provide strong evidence of the correlation asserted by Applicants. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the totality of the evidence clearly supports the conclusion that one of skill in the art understands that, more likely than not, levels of mRNA directly correlate with levels of corresponding proteins.

In addition to the evidence submitted by the PTO in support of Applicants' position, Applicants previously submitted evidence in support of the assertion that changes in mRNA are positively correlated to changes in protein levels. Applicants previously submitted a copy of a second Declaration by J. Christopher Grimaldi, an expert in the field of cancer biology (previously attached as Exhibit 2 in the Response mailed September 22, 2004). As stated in

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

paragraph 5 of the declaration, "Those who work in this field are well aware that in the vast majority of cases, when a gene is over-expressed...the gene product or polypeptide will also be over-expressed.... This same principal applies to gene under-expression." Further, "the detection of increased mRNA expression is expected to result in increased polypeptide expression, and the detection of decreased mRNA expression is expected to result in decreased polypeptide expression. The detection of increased or decreased polypeptide expression can be used for cancer diagnosis and treatment." The references cited in the declaration and submitted herewith support this statement.

Applicants also previously submitted a copy of the declaration of Paul Polakis, Ph.D. (previously attached as Exhibit 3 in the Response mailed September 22, 2004), an expert in the field of cancer biology. As stated in paragraph 6 of his declaration:

Based on my own experience accumulated in more than 20 years of research, including the data discussed in paragraphs 4 and 5 above [showing a positive correlation between mRNA levels and encoded protein levels in the vast majority of cases] and my knowledge of the relevant scientific literature, it is my considered scientific opinion that for human genes, an increased level of mRNA in a tumor cell relative to a normal cell typically correlates to a similar increase in abundance of the encoded protein in the tumor cell relative to the normal cell. In fact, *it remains a central dogma in molecular biology that increased mRNA levels are predictive of corresponding increased levels of the encoded protein.* (Emphasis added).

Dr. Polakis acknowledges that there are published cases where such a correlation does not exist, but states that it is his opinion, based on over 20 years of scientific research, that "such reports are exceptions to the commonly understood general rule that increased mRNA levels are predictive of corresponding increased levels of the encoded protein." (Polakis Declaration, paragraph 6).

The statements of Grimaldi and Polakis are supported by the teachings in Molecular Biology of the Cell, a leading textbook in the field (Bruce Alberts, *et al.*, Molecular Biology of the Cell (3rd ed. 1994) (submitted herewith as Exhibit 1) and (4th ed. 2002) (submitted in the Response mailed February 10, 2005 as Exhibit 1)). Figure 9-2 of Alberts, 3rd ed. shows the steps at which eukaryotic gene expression can be controlled. The first step depicted is transcriptional control. Alberts, 3rd ed. provides that "[f]or most genes transcriptional controls are paramount. This makes sense because, of all the possible control points illustrated in Figure 9-2, only

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

transcriptional control ensures that no superfluous intermediates are synthesized.” Alberts, 3rd ed., at 403 (emphasis added). In addition, the text states that “Although controls on the initiation of gene transcription are the predominant form of regulation for most genes, other controls can act later in the pathway from RNA to protein to modulate the amount of gene product that is made.” Alberts, 3rd ed., at 453 (emphasis added). Thus, as established in Alberts, 3rd ed., the predominant mechanism for regulating the amount of protein produced is by regulating transcription initiation.

In Alberts, 4th ed., Figure 6-3 on page 302 illustrates the basic principle that there is a correlation between increased gene expression and increased protein expression. The accompanying text states that “a cell can change (or regulate) the expression of each of its genes according to the needs of the moment – *most obviously by controlling the production of its mRNA*.” Alberts, 4th ed., at 302 (emphasis added). Similarly, Figure 6-90 on page 364 of Alberts, 4th ed. illustrates the path from gene to protein. The accompanying text states that while potentially each step can be regulated by the cell, “the initiation of transcription is the most common point for a cell to regulate the expression of each of its genes.” Alberts, 4th ed., at 364 (emphasis added). This point is repeated on page 379, where the authors state that of all the possible points for regulating protein expression, “[f]or most genes transcriptional controls are paramount.” Alberts, 4th ed., at 379 (emphasis added).

Further support for Applicants’ position can be found in the textbook, Genes VI, (Benjamin Lewin, Genes VI (1997)) (submitted in the Response mailed February 10, 2005 as Exhibit 2) which states “having acknowledged that control of gene expression can occur at multiple stages, and that production of RNA cannot inevitably be equated with production of protein, it is clear that the overwhelming majority of regulatory events occur at the initiation of transcription.” Genes VI at 847-848 (emphasis added).

Additional support is also found in Zhigang *et al.*, World Journal of Surgical Oncology 2:13, 2004, (submitted in the Response mailed February 10, 2005 as Exhibit 3). Zhigang studied the expression of prostate stem cell antigen (PSCA) protein and mRNA to validate it as a potential molecular target for diagnosis and treatment of human prostate cancer. The data showed “a high degree of correlation between PSCA protein and mRNA expression.” Zhigang at 6. Of the samples tested, 81 out of 87 showed a high degree of correlation between mRNA

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

expression and protein expression. The authors conclude that “it is demonstrated that PSCA protein and mRNA overexpressed in human prostate cancer, and that the increased protein level of PSCA was resulted from the upregulated transcription of its mRNA.” Zhigang at 11. Even though the correlation between mRNA expression and protein expression occurred in 93% of the samples tested, not 100%, the authors state that “PSCA may be a promising molecular marker for the clinical prognosis of human Pca and a valuable target for diagnosis and therapy of this tumor.” *Id.*

Further, Meric *et al.*, Molecular Cancer Therapeutics, vol. 1, 971-979 (2002), (submitted in the Response mailed February 10, 2005 as Exhibit 4), states the following:

The **fundamental principle** of molecular therapeutics in cancer is to exploit the differences in gene expression between cancer cells and normal cells...[M]ost efforts have concentrated on identifying differences in gene expression at the level of mRNA, which can be attributable to either DNA amplification or to differences in transcription. Meric *et al.* at 971 (emphasis added).

Those of skill in the art would not be focusing on differences in gene expression between cancer cells and normal cells if there were no correlation between gene expression and protein expression.

Together, the declarations of Grimaldi and Polakis, the accompanying references, and the excerpts and references provided above all establish that the accepted understanding in the art is that there is a reasonable correlation between changes in gene expression and the level of the encoded protein.

In response to the Polakis Declaration, the PTO states that “it is important to note that the instant specification provides no information regarding decreased mRNA levels of PRO1357 in tumor samples relative to normal samples. Only relative gene expression data was presented.” Final Office Action, page 5. This basis for dismissing the Polakis Declaration is unclear. In Example 18, Applicants do present information regarding decreased mRNA levels of PRO1357 in tumor samples relative to normal samples. Further, there is no basis for the PTO to conclude that information regarding decreased mRNA levels of PRO1357 in tumor samples relative to normal samples was not provided, when the PTO concedes that relative gene expression was provided.

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

As additional basis for dismissing the Polakis Declaration, the PTO states, “Only Dr. Polakis’ conclusions are provided in the declaration. There is no evidentiary support.” Final Office Action, page 5. Applicants submit that the declaration of Mr. Polakis is based on personal knowledge of the relevant facts at issue. The Polakis Declaration establishes Mr. Polakis as an expert in the field. Applicants remind the PTO that “[o]ffice personnel must accept an opinion from a qualified expert that is based upon relevant facts whose accuracy is not being questioned.” PTO Utility Examination Guidelines (2001) (emphasis added). In addition, declarations relating to issues of fact should not be summarily dismissed as “opinions” without an adequate explanation of how the declaration fails to rebut the Examiner’s position. *In re Alton* 76 F.3d 1168 (Fed. Cir. 1996). Thus, allegation that a declaration is merely opinion cannot serve as an independent basis for dismissing the declaration: it is a conclusion that can only be reached upon the presentation of facts adequately rebutting the opinion.

As further support of the declaration by Mr. Polakis, Applicants submitted in the Response mailed February 10, 2005, evidentiary support of Alberts 4th ed., Lewin, Zhigang and Meric. In the Advisory Action, the PTO determined the evidence to be unpersuasive because “[t]he argument of correlation between nucleic acid and protein expression has been previously addressed.” Advisory Action, page 2. Applicants submit that the fact that a rejection has been previously addressed cannot serve as sufficient basis to dismiss additional evidence presented by the Applicants. “It is essential for Office personnel to recognize, fully consider and respond to each substantive element of any response to a rejection based on lack of utility. Only where the totality of the record continues to show that the asserted utility is not specific, substantial, and credible should a rejection based on lack of utility be maintained.” M.P.E.P. § 2107 (emphasis added). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request consideration of the evidence previously presented by Applicants which support Applicants position that levels of mRNA typically correlate to abundance of the encoded protein.

As a final basis for dismissing the Polakis Declaration, the PTO cites Hu *et al.* (J. Proteome Res., 2(4):405-12 (2003)) for support for its assertion the literature cautions researchers from drawing conclusions based on small changes in transcript expression levels between normal and cancerous tissue. The PTO states that Hu teaches that not all genes with increased expression in cancer have a known or published role in cancer.

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

In Hu, the researchers used an automated literature-mining tool to summarize and estimate the relative strengths of all human gene-disease relationships published on Medline. They then generated a microarray expression dataset comparing breast cancer and normal breast tissue. Using their data-mining tool, they looked for a correlation between the strength of the literature association between the gene and breast cancer, and the magnitude of the difference in expression level. They report that for genes displaying a 5-fold change or less in tumors compared to normal, there was no evidence of a correlation between altered gene expression and a *known* role in the disease. See Hu at 411. However, among genes with a 10-fold or more change in expression level, there was a strong correlation between expression level and a *published* role in the disease. *Id.* at 412. Importantly, Hu reports that the observed correlation was only found among estrogen receptor-positive tumors, not less-prevalent ER-negative tumors. *Id.*

The general findings of Hu are not surprising – one would expect that genes with the greatest change in expression in a disease would be the first targets of research, and therefore have the strongest known relationship to the disease as measured by the number of publications reporting a connection with the disease. The correlation reported in Hu only indicates that the greater the change in expression level, the more likely it is that there is a *published* or *known* role for the gene in the disease, as found by their automated literature-mining software. Thus, Hu's results merely reflect a bias in the literature toward studying the most prominent targets, and reflect nothing regarding the ability of a gene that is 2-fold or more differentially expressed in tumors to serve as a disease marker. Hu acknowledges the shortcomings of this method in explaining the disparity in Hu's findings for ER-negative versus ER-positive tumors: Hu attributes the "bias in the literature" toward the more prevalent ER-positive tumors as the explanation for the lack of any correlation between number of publications and gene expression levels in less-prevalent (and, therefore, less studied) ER-negative tumors. *Id.* Because of this intrinsic bias, Hu's methodology is unlikely to ever note a correlation of a disease with less differentially-expressed genes and their corresponding proteins, regardless of whether or not an actual relationship between the disease and less differentially-expressed genes exists. Accordingly, Hu's methodology yields results that provide little or no information regarding biological significance of genes with less than 5-fold expression change in disease.

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

Applicants submit that a lack of known role for PRO1357 in cancer does not prevent its use as a diagnostic tool for cancer. There is a difference between use of a gene for distinguishing between tumor and normal tissue on the one hand, and establishing a role for the gene in cancer on the other. Genes with lower levels of change in expression may or may not be the most important genes in causing the disease, but the genes can still show a consistent and measurable change in expression. While such genes may or may not be good targets for further research, they can nonetheless be used as diagnostic tools. Thus, Hu does not refute the Applicants' assertion that the PRO1357 gene can be used as a cancer diagnostic tool because it is differentially expressed in certain tumors.

In further asserting lack of utility, the PTO states, "Because it is not known if the nucleic acid is involved in causing (or suppressing) the tumor, the skilled artisan could not use it therapeutically as a target for treatment of a tumor." Final Office Action, page 3. Applicants submit that a lack of known role for PRO1357 in cancer does not prevent its use as a diagnostic tool for cancer. The fact that there is no known translocation or mutation of PRO1357, for example, is irrelevant to whether its differential expression can be used to assist in diagnosis of cancer – one does not need to know why PRO1357 is differentially expressed, or what the consequence of the differential expression is, in order to exploit the differential expression to distinguish tumor from normal tissue. In fact the Revised Interim Utility Guidelines promulgated by the PTO recognize that proteins which are differentially expressed in cancer have utility. (*See* the caveat in Example 12 which state that the utility requirement is satisfied where a protein is expressed in melanoma cells but not on normal skin and antibodies against the protein can be used to diagnose cancer.) In addition, while Applicants appreciate that actions taken in other applications are not binding on the PTO with respect to the present application, Applicants note that the PTO has issued several patents claiming differentially expressed polypeptides. (*See, e.g.,* U.S. Patent No. 6,414,117 and U.S. Patent No. 6,124,433, attached hereto as Exhibits 3 and 4.)

Accordingly, Applicants submit that they have offered sufficient evidence to establish that it is more likely than not that one of skill in the art would believe that because the PRO1357 mRNA is more highly expressed in normal lung and stomach tumor tissues compared to normal lung and stomach tissues, respectively, the PRO1357 polypeptide will have the same expression

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

pattern. This differential expression of PRO1357 and related polypeptides make them useful as diagnostic tools for cancer.

The Arguments made by the PTO are Not Sufficient to satisfy the PTO's Initial Burden of Offering Evidence "that one of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably doubt the asserted utility"

As stated above, an Applicant's assertion of utility creates a presumption of utility that will be sufficient to satisfy the utility requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 101, "unless there is a reason for one skilled in the art to question the objective truth of the statement of utility or its scope." *In re Langer*, 503 F.2d 1380, 1391, 183 USPQ 288, 297 (CCPA 1974). The evidentiary standard to be used throughout *ex parte* examination in setting forth a rejection is a preponderance of the evidence, or "more likely than not" standard. *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992). This is stated explicitly in the M.P.E.P.:

[T]he applicant does not have to provide evidence sufficient to establish that an asserted utility is true "beyond a reasonable doubt." **Nor must the applicant provide evidence such that it establishes an asserted utility as a matter of statistical certainty.** Instead, evidence will be sufficient if, considered as a whole, it leads a person of ordinary skill in the art to conclude that the asserted utility is more likely than not. M.P.E.P. at § 2107.02, part VII (2004) (underline emphasis in original, bold emphasis added, internal citations omitted).

The PTO has the initial burden to offer evidence "that one of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably doubt the asserted utility." *In re Brana*, 51 F.3d 1560, 1566, 34 U.S.P.Q.2d 1436 (Fed. Cir. 1995). Only then does the burden shift to the Applicant to provide rebuttal evidence. *Id.* As stated in the M.P.E.P., such rebuttal evidence does not need to absolutely prove that the asserted utility is real. Rather, the evidence only needs to be reasonably indicative of the asserted utility.

The PTO has not offered any arguments or cited any references to establish "that one of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably doubt" that the disclosed polypeptide is differentially expressed in certain tumors and that the claimed polypeptides can be used as diagnostic tools. Given the lack of support for the PTO's position, Applicants submit that the PTO has not met its initial burden of overcoming the presumption that the asserted utility is sufficient to satisfy the utility requirement. And even if the PTO has met that burden, the Applicants' supporting

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

rebuttal evidence is sufficient to establish that one of skill in the art would be more likely than not to believe that the claimed polypeptides can be used as diagnostic tools for cancer, particularly lung and stomach cancer.

Specific Utility

The Asserted Substantial Utilities are Specific to the Claimed Polypeptides

Applicants next argue that the asserted utilities are specific to the claimed polypeptides related to PRO1357.

Specific Utility is defined as utility which is “specific to the subject matter claimed,” in contrast to “a general utility that would be applicable to the broad class of the invention.” M.P.E.P. § 2107.01 I. Applicants submit that the evidence of differential expression of the PRO1357 gene and polypeptide in certain types of tumor cells, along with the declarations and references discussed above, provide a specific utility for the claimed polypeptides.

As discussed above, there are significant data which show that the gene for the PRO1357 polypeptide is more highly expressed in normal lung and stomach tissue compared to lung tumor and stomach tumor tissue, respectively. These data are strong evidence that the PRO1357 gene and polypeptide are associated with lung and stomach tumors. Thus, contrary to the assertions of the PTO, Applicants submit that they have provided evidence associating the PRO1357 gene and polypeptide with a specific disease. The asserted utility as a diagnostic tool for cancer, particularly lung and stomach tumor, is a specific utility – it is not a general utility that would apply to the broad class of polypeptides.

Conclusion

The PTO has asserted the following arguments to support its conclusion that based on the cited literature, one of skill in the art would not assume that the increase in gene expression of PRO1357 would correlate with increased mRNA or polypeptide levels: (1) the PTO has challenged the reliability of the evidence reported in Example 18; and (2) the PTO cites Hu *et al.*, Konopka *et al.* and Haynes *et al.* to support its assertion that the literature cautions against drawing conclusions based on small changes in transcript expression levels between normal and cancerous tissue, and that mRNA levels are not predictive of protein levels. The PTO states that

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

further research needs to be done to determine if the increase or decrease in PRO1357 DNA supports a role for the peptide in cancerous tissue. Applicants have addressed each of these arguments in turn.

First, the Applicants provided a first Declaration of Chris Grimaldi stating that the gene expression data in Example 18 are real and significant. This declaration also indicates that given the relative difference of at least two-fold in expression levels, the disclosed nucleic acids and corresponding polypeptides have utility as cancer diagnostic tools. Thus, the PTO has not offered any substantial reason or evidence to question the data in Example 18, or the first Grimaldi Declaration.

Second, Applicants have shown that the second Grimaldi Declaration and Polakis Declaration, the accompanying references, as well as the excerpts and references cited above, demonstrate that it is well-established in the art that a change in mRNA levels generally correlates to a corresponding change in protein levels. Haynes *et al.* does not address this issue, and is not contrary to Applicants' asserted utility. Hu *et al.* does not support the PTO's position that small changes in expression levels are unreliable, and is not contrary to Applicants' asserted utility. Thus, the PTO has not offered any substantial reason or evidence to question these declarations and supporting references.

Third, the Applicants have shown that none of the references cited by the PTO to support its position or are contrary to Applicants' asserted utility. Therefore, these references do not satisfy the PTO's burden of offering evidence to prove that one of skill in the art would reasonably doubt the asserted utility.

Finally, Applicants have pointed out that the substantial utilities described above are specific to the claimed polypeptides because the PRO1357 gene and polypeptide are differentially expressed in certain cancer cells compared to the corresponding normal cells. This is not a general utility that would apply to the broad class of polypeptides.

Given the totality of the evidence provided, Applicants submit that they have established a substantial, specific, and credible utility for the claimed polypeptides as diagnostic tools. According to the PTO Utility Examination Guidelines (2001), irrefutable proof of a claimed utility is not required. Rather, a specific, substantial, and credible utility requires only a "reasonable" confirmation of a real world context of use. Applicants remind the PTO that:

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

A small degree of utility is sufficient . . . The claimed invention must only be capable of performing some beneficial function . . . An invention does not lack utility merely because the particular embodiment disclosed in the patent lacks perfection or performs crudely . . . A commercially successful product is not required . . . Nor is it essential that the invention accomplish all its intended functions . . . or operate under all conditions . . . partial success being sufficient to demonstrate patentable utility . . . In short, **the defense of non-utility cannot be sustained without proof of total incapacity.** If an invention is only partially successful in achieving a useful result, a rejection of the claimed invention as a whole based on a lack of utility is not appropriate. M.P.E.P. at 2107.01 (underline emphasis in original, bold emphasis added, citations omitted).

Applicants submit that they have established that it is more likely than not that one of skill in the art would reasonably accept the utility for the claimed polypeptides relating to PRO1357 set forth in the specification. In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the PTO reconsider and withdraw the utility rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph – Enablement

The PTO also rejects the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Specifically, the PTO asserts that because the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific or substantial asserted utility or a well-established utility, one skilled in the art would not know how to use the claimed invention.

Applicants submit that in the discussion of the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection above, Applicants have established a substantial, specific, and credible utility for the claimed polypeptides. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the PTO reconsider and withdraw the enablement rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph – Written Description

The PTO maintains the rejection of Claims 1-5, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to satisfy the written description requirement for the reasons set forth on pages 9-10 of the previous Office Action. Briefly, the PTO argues that nucleic acids that are non-identical to SEQ ID NO:77 with the claimed expression pattern are not described. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

The Legal Standard for Written Description

The well-established test for sufficiency of support under the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph is whether the disclosure “reasonably conveys to artisan that the inventor had possession at that time of the later claimed subject matter.” *In re Kaslow*, 707 F.2d 1366, 1375, 2121 USPQ 1089, 1096 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *see also Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d at 1563, 19 USPQ2d at 1116 (Fed. Cir. 1991). The adequacy of written description support is a factual issue and is to be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See e.g., Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d at 1563, 19 USPQ2d at 1116 (Fed. Cir. 1991). The factual determination in a written description analysis depends on the nature of the invention and the amount of knowledge imparted to those skilled in the art by the disclosure. *Union Oil v. Atlantic Richfield Co.*, 208 F.3d 989, 996 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

The Current Invention is Adequately Described

As noted above, whether the Applicants were in possession of the invention as of the effective filing date of an application is a factual determination, reached by the consideration of a number of factors, including the level of knowledge and skill in the art, and the teaching provided by the specification. The inventor is not required to describe every single detail of his/her invention. An Applicant’s disclosure obligation varies according to the art to which the invention pertains. The present invention pertains to the field of recombinant DNA/protein technology. It is well-established that the level of skill in this field is very high since a representative person of skill is generally a Ph.D. scientist with several years of experience. Accordingly, the teaching imparted in the specification must be evaluated through the eyes of a highly skilled artisan as of the date the invention was made.

The pending claims are related to isolated polypeptides having at least 95% or 99% amino acid sequence identity to several polypeptides related to SEQ ID NO:78, and satisfy the limitation “wherein said isolated polypeptide is more highly expressed in normal stomach tissue or normal lung tissue compared to stomach tumor or lung tumor, respectively, or wherein said isolated polypeptide is encoded by a polynucleotide that is more highly expressed in normal stomach tissue or normal lung tissue compared to stomach tumor or lung tumor, respectively” or “ wherein said isolated polypeptide or a fragment thereof can be used to generate an antibody

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

which can be used to specifically detect the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 78 in lung or stomach tissue samples.”

Applicants maintain that there is no substantial variation within the species which fall within the scope of the amended claims, which require at least 95% or 99% amino acid sequence identity to the disclosed sequences related to SEQ ID NO:78. Applicants note that the pending Claims are analogous to the claims discussed in Example 14 of the written description training materials. In Example 14, the written description requirement was found to be satisfied for claims relating to polypeptides having 95% homology to a particular sequence and possessing a particular catalytic activity, even though the applicant had not made any variants. Similarly, the pending claims also have very high sequence homology to the disclosed sequences and must share the same expression pattern in certain tumors, or share an epitope sufficient to generate antibodies which specifically detect the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:78 in lung or stomach tissue samples.

In Example 14, the procedures for making variants were known in the art and the disclosure taught how to test for the claimed catalytic activity. Similarly, in the instant application, it is well known in the art how to make polypeptides with at least 95% amino acid sequence identity to the disclosed sequences. In addition, the specification discloses how to test to determine if the polypeptide or encoding nucleic acid is differentially expressed in lung or stomach tumors, and how to make antibodies which specifically detect the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:78 in lung or stomach tissue samples. Like Example 14, the genus of polypeptides that have at least 95% or 99% amino acid sequence identity to the disclosed sequences will not have substantial variation.

Furthermore, while Applicants appreciate that actions taken by the PTO in other applications are not binding with respect to the examination of the present application, Applicants note that the PTO has issued many patents containing claims to variant nucleic acids or variant proteins where the applicants did not actually make such nucleic acids or proteins. Representative patents include U.S. Patent No. 6,737,522, U.S. Patent No. 6,395,306, U.S. Patent No. 6,025,156, U.S. Patent No. 6,645,499, U.S. Patent No. 6,498,235, and U.S. Patent No. 6,730,502 which were attached in the Response mailed February 10, 2005 as Exhibits 5-10.

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

In conclusion, Applicants submit that they have satisfied the written description requirement for the pending claims based on the actual reduction to practice of SEQ ID NO:78, by specifying a high level of amino acid sequence identity, by describing how to test for differential expression of the polypeptide and encoding nucleic acid, and by describing how to make antibodies to the disclosed sequence, all of which result in a lack of substantial variability in the species falling within the scope of the instant claims. Applicants submit that this disclosure would allow one of skill in the art to "recognize that the applicant was in possession of the necessary common attributes or features of the elements possessed by the members of the genus." Hence, Applicants respectfully request that the PTO reconsider and withdraw the written description rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) – Anticipation

Claims 1-8 and 11-13 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 01/16318 and WO 00/12708.

The data in Example 18 were disclosed in priority application, PCT/US00/23328 filed August 24, 2000, which is the PCT application published as WO 01/16318. As discussed above, the instant claimed subject matter has utility based upon the data in Example 18 and the instant application is a continuation of PCT/US00/23328; therefore, the present claims are entitled to the filing date of August 24, 2000. WO 01/16318 is not prior art under § 102(b).

WO 00/12708 was published on March 9, 2000, which is less than one year before the filing of priority application PCT/US00/23328 (August 24, 2000). Again, PCT/US00/23328 discloses the differential expression data which provides utility for the instant claims, and Applicants are entitled to the filing date of August 24, 2000. Therefore, WO 00/12708 cannot be cited under § 102(b).

In view of the above discussion, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under § 102(b) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully maintain that claims are patentable and request that they be passed to issue. Applicants invite the Examiner to call the undersigned if any remaining issues might be resolved by telephone.

Appl. No. : 10/063,586
Filed : May 3, 2002

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: April 1, 2005

By: AnneMarie Kaiser
AnneMarie Kaiser
Registration No. 37,649
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 30,313
(619) 235-8550

1437573_1
032505